

*Minor edits made to document by Sherry Foot

RAC Subgroup Conference Call Minutes

NWX-DOI BUREAU OF LAND M

Moderator: Sherry Foot
June 24, 2013
11:00 a.m. (MT)

RAC subgroup members in attendance: Lowell Braxton, Porter Teegarden, Jim Allison, Rick Ellis, Steve Burr, Bill Hopkin, John Harja

BLM employees in attendance: Sherry Foot, Bunny Sterin, Juan Palma

Members of the public in attendance (on call): Cameron Witten, The Wilderness Society and Ray Peterson, Emery County Public Lands Administrator

Coordinator: Excuse me, this is the conference operator. I'd like to inform all participants that today's conference call is being recorded. If you have any objection, you may disconnect at this time. Thank you.

Sherry Foot: Good morning callers. I just wanted to let you know that whenever you wish to speak, state your name. The reason being is that when these minutes are transcribed and if you don't identify yourself, it just comes up with Woman or Man.

Be respectful of each other. Place your phones on mute and not on hold. Be in a location that is free of external noises because we can hear those while you are on the call. Silence cell phones. If you have any questions, please identify yourself. Also, for public comment period, as soon as the official RAC Subgroup business meeting is over, we will go ahead and take public comment. Lowell Braxton is our Chair at this time, and he will be here until about 11 o'clock, and then will have to skip out after that, but will try to be back in case the phone call happens to go a little bit longer. I think that's everything that I have to share at this point, and I'd like to turn the time over to Jim, who is going to just give us a little overview of what happened at our

last meeting, and maybe he and Bunny can just share with us what they're looking for, for this meeting as well.

Jim Allison: Sherry, did you want to say, officially, who's here?

Sherry Foot: For the record, John Harja, Lowell Braxton, Bill Hopkin, Jim Allison, Bunny Sterin and myself, Sherry Foot from the Utah State Office location. In the field, Rick Ellis, RAC member, and for the members of the public, Cam Witten from the Wilderness Society and Ray Petersen from Emery County Public Lands Administration.

Jim Allison: The point of the meeting, as I understand it, is to look at this revised draft of the Utah National Conservation Lands Strategy. We've looked at a previous draft and made some extensive comments on it. Now we're going to, I guess, make another round of comments in response to the changes that have been made, and hopefully work toward getting this ready to release to the public sometime relatively soon. I know the BLM's anxious to do that. So I don't know, Lowell, am I just in charge?

Lowell Braxton: Yes, that fine. I think one of you just run the show, if you wouldn't mind doing... Welcome Juan Palma.

Jim Allison: Okay.

Juan Palma: Thank you. Sorry I'm a little late.

Jim Allison: Why don't we start with my comments. I have two comments, one of which is - well I think they both sort of reiterate things that I mentioned in the previous draft. Overall, I think this is a big improvement. It's much clearer now than it was in the previous draft.

But there are two general issues. I would really like to know who's doing what, right. Let's just go to the very beginning, under Goal 1A, it says, "Ensure that new, revised and amended resource management plans protect the values of national conservation lands." Who's in charge of doing that?

Or maybe more to the point, the second bullet point under there, "Engage statewide stakeholders for input on managing national conservation lands in

Utah," who's doing that? So, there are actions here, some of which seem obviously to be, to fall under the purview of the state office. Others probably are getting done by the field offices, and it's not very clear who's doing what. It actually is clear - and I really like the way it's done when we go back to the appendices, and there it even - a lot of these specific goals are actually assigned to a specific field office. So under Wild and Scenic Rivers, although obviously all the wild and scenic rivers are in the St. George field office, but it says, "The St. George field office will complete inventories of resource values along designated wild and scenic river segments."

So at least as I understand it, part of the - one goal of this document is to help people within the BLM know what they should be doing, and at least in the beginning, I'm not sure you could hand this to somebody in the field office and have them easily figure out what they're supposed to do.

So it would be good, to just say that, the state office is responsible for conducting training, but the field offices, each field office or the national conservation lands lead within each field office is responsible for some of these other specific actions. So that's my main general comment.

The other thing is - this is something I brought up earlier...

Juan Palma: So Jim, if I understand you right on that comment is that, while it belongs to all of us, it belongs to none of us, sort of so generic that who's going to (repeat) that?

Jim Allison: It just doesn't say it. Yes, and it gets back - I griped a lot about writing in bullet points on the previous draft, and I think bullet points sort of lead you to write in sentence fragments, and that's a lot of what we have are sentence fragments and no subjects and needs verbs - well, there's verbs, I guess. So ensure, engage - the sentences start with verbs - or the fragments, I guess, start with verbs, and there's no subject there saying, Bunny is in charge of this and Aaron does that, and the St. George field office does that.

Bunny Sterin: Well, can I comment on that? This is Bunny. We - I tried that, and it just seemed really repetitive, the state office will ensure that. That's why I went back to this format, because we - I tried it and it didn't seem to work. Because this was really - the NLCS state office and the field offices where predominantly this would be done with state office oversight or the state office would do it. And then when we went into the appendix, it's much more specific. I did try to do that, and it just seemed like every sentence started out with the state office will.

I basically went back to this format because it just seemed like these are the goals and the actions that the state will take as a whole, and then went more specifically in the back.

Jim Allison: Are they - but is everything in this whole first section really going to fall under the state office?

Bunny Sterin: Well it's not necessarily the state office, but all the NLCS units as well as the state office will be involved in this. These are the things that we should be striving for, these actions, for all of the NLCS units, or the NLCS leads, so either from the state office perspective or from the field office. So for example, like under Goal 1B, Develop Citizen Science Partnerships, all of the NLCS units should be driving to reach that, those actions.

Lowell Braxton: Well that's something that a delegation of authority table or something like that could just present on a one-page...

Jim Allison: Possibly. That was a thought I had, that maybe one thing to do is have a list. Well, okay, so actually let me go at it from two different ways. One possibility is to avoid that redundancy problem is just to say once, the state office will, colon, and then have a list of bullet points that the state office is responsible for, if it's two or three or whatever, and then field offices will be responsible to, another colon and then the other bullet points.

They don't necessarily have to go at the start of every bullet point, but it just needs to be clear. But I think something like Lowell was talking about, a

delegation table or whatever, I don't know if it has to be part of this document, but certainly, as I imagine this working, I think it would be really helpful to be able to hand the field office managers, or the NLCS leads in the field offices a list of, you know, here are the things in the strategy that you are responsible for as opposed to us in the state office.

My main concern is that it still wasn't clear to me who exactly was going to be responsible for each of these things, like developing citizen science partnerships. That's probably mostly going to happen in the field with the individual units. But other things pretty clearly are going to be the responsibility of the state office.

The other thing goes back to the question of priorities, which I think several of us raised on the previous draft. It still isn't clear, assuming that it's pretty likely that you're not going to have the resources to everything you'd like to do in this document, so which things are going to happen first? And I think that still isn't clear, what those, what the priorities are.

Bunny Sterin: Just as a comment, but we'll make it more clear as we make the final document. It's listed in order of priorities.

Jim Allison: Okay.

Bunny Sterin: But obviously that's not clear, so...

Jim Allison: Yes, just - all you need is one sentence to say that, you know, it's listed in order of priority.

Bunny Sterin: Yes.

Steve Burr: I apologize for getting on late. My question, Bunny, have you sent out a rewrite? I didn't see that in my email.

Bunny Sterin: I already did, yes.

Steve Burr: When did you send that out?

Bill Hopkin: Ten days ago.

Bunny Sterin: Yes, about ten days ago.

Jim Allison: I think actually it was Wednesday...

Sherry Foot: And then I resent it again, I think.

Rick Ellis: This is Rick Ellis. I never received it either. I've just gone back through and looked, and I didn't find it either.

Steve Burr: Yes, I don't think I have. I've been keeping my out for it, and I remember Lowell saying oh, you know, we would have one for this call today, and I've not received that yet.

Sherry Foot: Okay, I will go ahead and resend it while you folks are on the phone.

Jim Allison: Okay, those are my comments. I didn't find a lot of little things to pick on, unless we're talking, you know, there's a couple of typographical things about this, but nothing worth bringing up now, I think. So does somebody else want to step in and... Folks on the phone don't have copies.

Bill Hopkin: I can go ahead. This is Bill. First of all, I just had some kind of general questions, because it wasn't clear to me. Will each of these NLCS units be administered on their own, independent of the district or field office? Or are they under the field office?

Bunny Sterin: It depends on what unit. Grand Staircase is its own unit, more or less similar to a BLM district. The two NCAs are managed under the St. George field office. And the rest of the units are managed as they are in the field office. They're a component of the field office management.

Bill Hopkin: Okay.

Juan Palma: The only one that may be a little different, Bill, is that we have the Trails system but, you know, the - in terms of overall, we have a person here, because they have to work very closely with the Park Service. But in terms of the management of on the ground, it would still be as Bunny just mentioned, it will still be at that, whatever the local unit is, whether it's the field office or a district.

And so to answer your question, all those units are not separate units, but they fall under their own respective normal chain of command BLM organization.

So if there is a trail system in the West Desert that's the Salt Lake field office, that on the ground management would be by the Salt Lake field office.

If there was a NLCS unit of scenic, wild and scenic rivers under St. George/Washington County, that segment of that river would be managed by that local unit, the St. George field office. The only one that's a little different is the Grand Staircase, which is a unit all to itself. I hope that answered your question.

Bill Hopkin: Yes, it does, right. I guess part of the question, going a little further is, so I was under the impression when - I forget his name, from St. George.

Juan Palma: Jimmy?

Bill Hopkin: That those two units basically did their own management plan. Is that under the direction of the field office? Okay.

Juan Palma: So those documents, because they're planning documents; they will go through the normal chain of command, so those documents will be formulated by contractor and the local unit, and then eventually they'll go up to the district office and eventually up here to the state office, those documents to be reviewed, those plans.

Any kind of a planning document is signed by myself - the state director, or whoever it might be. So that's the normal chain of command. Even though they're working at them at the very local level, eventually they will be signed by the state director.

Bill Hopkin: Okay.

Lowell Braxton: Do they just then fold into the resource management plan for that field office or district office?

Juan Palma: In this case they'll be their own independent plans for the Red Cliffs as well as the Beaver Wash Dam. And then the third thing they're doing on the St. George is that they're amending their current RMP, but the two will be subsets of the unit, of the field office.

Jim Allison: That is, their RMPs.

Bill Hopkin: Okay so, then following that, in the case of Beaver Dam and what is it, Red Cliffs?

Juan Palma: Red Cliff, right.

Bill Hopkin: Do they have their own separate budget? Or is it part of the field office budget?

Juan Palma: It's part of the field office budget, but the way we segregate money in the BLM is like we have minerals money for oil and gas, we have range money for range activities, and then we have also money that comes down for NLCS type units that, so... But that money comes down through the normal pipe, if you will, from the state office to the district to the field office. It follows that same chain of command as it goes down.

But the color of money - I'm going to call it color of money, the color of money flowing to NLCS is separate from range or separate from oil and gas or separate from the others. We call it 1711, is the acronym that we use to denote that that's the kind of money that goes down for those kinds of activities.

Bill Hopkin: Okay, yes. Jim already brought this up. One of the things that concerned me a lot was prioritization. Not just within Wilderness or - but it seems to me like the state's strategic plan ought to have pretty clear designation of what the priorities are, based on both the human resources and the financial resources that are available to do it.

Then the other kind of overall comment was, I did try to go through some of those budgets that you were good enough to help me get, and I guess I am still not comfortable in here that we have addressed overall economic impact of these units and where that fits in at the local level and at the state office level.

Juan Palma: Bill, if I might explore that question just a little bit more. Are you meaning to say that it doesn't - the impacts are not very clear on the communities as positive or negative?

Bill Hopkin: And vice versa.

Juan Palma: Okay.

Bill Hopkin: That unit, on the communities and the community on the unit, in...

Juan Palma: On the unit.

Bill Hopkin: ...and that relationship. Bunny, in her email, down toward the bottom, she says it was suggested that we add more socio-economic to Goal 1C. We feel that it's covered adequately in Goal 2D. And I don't know that I agree with that, but...

Juan Palma: I see, 2D says, "Adopt a community-based approach to recreation and visitor services delivery..."

Bill Hopkin: Well, and then I went on through, you know, duty and in the units, looked at it and I, you know...

John Harja: Well I would have to, in some sense, Juan, agree with Bill on Goal 1C. You talked about providing a scientific foundation to decision-making. It certainly would be the state's preference that scientific foundation include economics. If this is designed to be only hard sciences, we would disagree with that. There's a lot of talk today that these conservation units bring economic prosperity to that area. Prove it. Let's get the economics together. You get a lot of data from your areas, let's start using it. Let's start understanding it. So I would say that maybe it's not number one priority in 1C but it should be in there that economic data, visitor surveys, all of that feeds into economic studies that can show this.

Bill Hopkin: Which includes cost, as well as...

John Harja: As well as costs.

Jim Allison: Although that is in 2 - yes, in 2D it does say...

John Harja: I'm just uncomfortable with the idea that science does not include economics. We have a lot of other places where you connect with communities, and they get a lot of good things going about encouraging people to visit, to do it properly and to, you know, spend money as they come, but...

Juan Palma: So one example, John, on your thought is that, to give you one example, that I don't have the real, absolute numbers, but I'm within the ballpark. The Grand

Staircase Monument in this - for - was right at the beginning, had somewhere in the range of 40 special recreation permits of all kinds. Now I think we're up at 190 today.

So there's a difference, of where it was, let's say ten years ago where it was today, but what does that mean economically to that part of the state? What does it mean to have 40 or 50 special recreation permits versus 190 or so? How many people are involved? What is it that they're doing? How much money ends up being infused? How much more employment is created? And those kinds of things is...

John Harja: Those are the kinds of things.

Juan Palma: Those are the kind of thing we're talking about.

John Harja: In addition, you talk about the visitation to the monument, specifically how much of it is windshield visitation and how much of it is people engaging in these kind of activities.

Juan Palma: Kind of activities, yes.

John Harja: And are they connected? For example, in the Escalante Corridor, are they connected to visitation?

Juan Palma: Yes.

Man: Yes.

John Harja: You're not going to answer that in one season, but...

Lowell Braxton: I think those comments need to be focused to the area that you're specifically talking about. I think we've all seen instances of when somebody will add in all the airfare from Stuttgart, Germany to Salt Lake City. And it makes a huge impact on that, but it doesn't impact the community at all. So isn't accurate data that we're talking about.

John Harja: But, yes, and with regard to that, I'm looking for connections with the local community...

Lowell Braxton: That's what I thought you were saying.

John Harja: Actually that is what I'm saying.

Bill Hopkin: Yes, (headwaters), economics kind of things.

Lowell Braxton: Yes. Well, we've dealt with that on wildlife issues, where they'll factor the amount spent on a new pickup truck into hunting licenses, all of a sudden, and you know that truck's only used for a couple of days but it - all \$30,000 of it goes into the hunting license (favorably), but we've all been there.

Bill Hopkin: Okay, all three. On Page 6, that last paragraph, it says, "BLM invites all those who care about these special areas, including stakeholders, partners, friends, groups, volunteers." I think you ought to have state, counties and community in that.

Bunny Sterin: Okay.

John Harja: Bill, that's the general comment I had throughout, and when I say I had comments, it appears in many places. I don't know if this document accurately represents the partnership with the state on wildlife, tourism, agriculture, grazing or anything like that. It's tossed in, in various places as a byproduct, and we would certainly hope we could get a little more status than that.

Bill Hopkin: Page 10, Theme 2 says, toward the end of that sentence, larger landscapes, I wish ecosystems, landscape scale and larger landscapes could be defined in the glossary, based on how you're using it in here, because everybody has a different perspective of that. And then up at the top, we're looking 2014 to 2018, aren't we? Five year?

Bunny Sterin: Yes.

Bill Hopkin: Okay.

Bunny Sterin: Oh, correct. Good catch.

Bill Hopkin: I guess in general, I wonder if the bullet points in this whole first part are even necessary. You know, I've done lots of plans around land uses, clearly way different than these. But if you state your overall goal, you leave yourself way more flexibility and leave it up to the units to figure out how they're going to incorporate that, unless the state feels they have got to have pretty rigid sideboards on that.

Lowell Braxton: I hear you, Bill, but I think you need to have some sideboards on there, otherwise folks are going to go native, for a lack of a better term.

Lowell Braxton: But you're right, Bill, and - in concept.

Jim Allison: Also, there are things that are happening at the state level that...

Lowell Braxton: That have to factor in.

Jim Allison: Yes, that ought to be factored in. So it's not just what happens in the individual units but, you know, there's training and things that the state office...

Bill Hopkin: Okay, so perhaps what you are recommending defines that better. That's the problem I had with the bullet points, is I couldn't tell whether the state office intended to do these, or if it was going to be pushed down to the, you know, to the units to fulfill the obligation of what's in those bullet points.

On Goal 1B, Page 11, first bullet says, "Design data collection protocols and (on certain) partners," which I have a problem with, depending on who the partners are, "to monitor resources, assure protocols are consistent, repeatable, reliable."

And then the last sentence, "Ensure that this information applies to landscapes across jurisdictional boundaries." Is it really the NLCS' responsibility - I don't quite understand that. I mean, it seems to me like NLCS lands are designated for a specific purpose, and what kind of comes out in several places in this document is that the NLCS is going to go ahead and do research that impacts the rest of the BLM.

And I don't know that I'd buy that, because conditions are very different, you know, on the eight other parts of BLM.

Bunny Sterin: One of the things, and this is much a relation to this, is the eco-regional assessments that are being done, they're not being done by the BLM, they're just being done in partnership with some of the universities and such, and that is intended to be looking at things on an eco-regional basis. That's part of what this is applying to that as well.

Those of working with universities to develop the protocol for doing the inventory and the monitoring on that - what this is intended to be, really to...

Steve Burr: If I could make a comment about that the specific units that are designated within the system, they do not exist nor operate within a vacuum. In other words, there are surrounding lands, both federal - other federal agencies, state lands, private lands and, you know, what happens on the units affects the surrounding lands and vice versa.

As Bunny said, one of the approaches that is now being taken more and more, is basically a landscape or an eco-regional level of assessment. And of course, adaptive management works right into that.

John Harja: Unfortunately, the way this one is worded - doesn't say that. What this appears to say, and I don't think this is your intent is that you create this information, or you gather this information, and then you make sure that it applies on private property. That was certainly not your intent, I'm sure.

Bunny Sterin: No.

John Harja: I would say, for example, I've watched WSAs be the generators of cheatgrass, and it spreads all over the place, and there's not anything you can do about it, so. This sentence needs to be rephrased that we intend to gather information on an eco-regional basis, and then make it available for folks to use.

Bill Hopkin: Good point. Again, the third bullet point on that one, I am really concerned about control of Citizen Science.

John Harja: This is a place that I would like to make sure the state is a partner of wildlife and agricultural data.

Bill Hopkin: Yes.

John Harja: I mean, it - we should be jointly doing this. Because we all use Citizen Scientist, TNC and others to do things. We have all kinds of people gathering that kind of data, but we want to make sure that it is controlled or managed properly through a joint effort.

- Bunny Sterin: As I indicated on the note that went out, this is one of the places where we'll have a sidebar with a note saying this is the science in here that explains it a little bit further. We just haven't developed those yet. So when we have the final document, we'll have some sidebar examples. The Citizen Science is one that we'll definitely have with the next iteration.
- Bill Hopkin: Good.
- John Harja: Jim, don't you use Citizen Archeologists and Rock Art posts and things that are commonly used? And doesn't UPAC kind of help manage it?
- Jim Allison: Yes - the organization not so much, but individual...
- John Harja: But the organization kind of pays...
- Bill Hopkin: Goal 1C, bottom of Page 11, the first bullet - I'm wondering what the Department of Commerce and the Department of Transportation have to do with this. It seems to me like it'd be really important in that bullet to also include and to coordinate with state agencies, county governments and local communities.
- Lowell Braxton: I think that's the point you made a while ago as well, John.
- John Harja: It's fine to have a network of federal agencies and maybe an explanation of what Commerce and Transportation offer is fine, but Department of Defense, for example, has a lot of basic research going on. It makes sense they ought to be included. But then again, right there, add a bullet that says, or a subset of that one that says, coordinate with the appropriate state agencies.
- Bill Hopkin: We're on the next page, 12, Goal 1E. I really don't like the language of limit discretionary uses to those compatible. We've had this deal with Grand Staircase and it bothers me that it appears to me that the Grand Staircase is already saying before the alternatives have been developed, they're already saying we're going to stop grazing in some of that.
- It's saying which areas are compatible for grazing and which are not. I don't think that ought to be a preconceived notion in that case. So I think you'd say provide for discretionary uses, to me those that aren't compatible, but I don't

think you ought to just start out saying we're going to start with a full herd of cows and we're going to start sorting them off.

Steve Burr: Juan, would you address what was just brought up with respect to the monument? Because I think you explained it very well to the Monument Advisory Committee with respect to grazing.

Juan Palma: Right now what we're looking at this, in terms of the EIS is to make sure that we just simply collect all the information that we have. And I would agree with Bill that the process is so early, and so in its infancy, we cannot predetermine at this moment in time what the outcome of that would be. At the end of the day, what we want to be able to do on the monument in terms of grazing is to make sure that we identify, at the landscape level, what it is that we need - that we need to incorporate grazing as part of our RMP. Some people will argue that point, but we do, it's - the RMP that we're relying on is back in the 1980s.

We need to bring it up to this current 2013-2014 time frame. We need to do that, Bill, right away. Steve, to your question - we need to take a look at that. In the analysis of that EIS, we need to be able to make sure that we account for the later data information or scientific - whatever all we need to rely upon, but that's part of the analysis.

It's part of the analysis and the formulation of the alternatives that we will do. Right now we just can't predetermine where and how much. You know, it'll come as part of the process.

Steve Burr: Yes, so the point is, at least from my understanding, nothing has been predetermined with respect to grazing on the monument, you know, especially as a unit within the NLCS. That being said, there's probably landscapes or areas down on the monument that can certainly sustain a healthy grazing program. Members of the MAC feel that that's a good thing. But we also recognize, as does management, that there's probably some areas down there that are unable, at least in this point of time because conditions,

you know, to sustain a healthy grazing program. Nothing has been predetermined down there.

Juan Palma: Yes. That's the way it should be. Whether some employees might have, or some general public employees might have I don't know - or just general population might.

Steve Burr: Yes, and I think that's a misconception, and it gets people riled up.

Juan Palma: Yes.

Bill Hopkin: Well it was kind of perpetuated by Rene's letter to the state inviting them to participate in the process.

Juan Palma: Yes.

Bill Hopkin: Because he says right in the letter which areas are not compatible with grazing and which are. Well that's fine. I mean, that's part of the EIS process. But I'm not so sure that the monument manager should be putting it in those terms to begin with before we even start.

The other thing I would hope, with regard to grazing, is that where grazing - and we know that it will be, it is an issue as far as land health and compatible with other issues. I don't think that means you just eliminate it there. I mean, you should look at grazing management alternatives that would make them compatible.

Steve Burr: Bill, I think all that'll be done. It's a matter of data collection--involved in this grazing EIS that's going to happen.

Juan Palma: Yes, that's right.

Bill Hopkin: But let me tie that back in, Steve, since you brought it up.

Steve Burr: Yes.

Bill Hopkin: Is that - well first an organization that I have dealt with a lot in Utah has been down there collecting data for a long time. And I know what their goal is. And, you know, that's why I pucker every time we talk about Citizen Data, because they just won an appeal in Utah, Northern Utah, and you're well aware of it.

Steve Burr: Yes, I am.

Bill Hopkin: Hopefully in the appeal that'll get looked at very carefully because what came out of that decision was not right. If you've got an organization or a group down there with an agenda who has been collecting "anti-grazing data" for six or eight or ten years, you're starting out behind the eight ball.

Steve Burr: I think that's one value of the Monument Advisory Committee is that a good portion of that group is made up of scientists, range managers and plant folks and systems ecology folks. Any science that's presented is going to have a rigorous review.

Rick Ellis: What I have gathered out of it, and I - maybe I can put Bill's concern in a different light, there is a lot of great people on those advisory boards. But the data being collected, is it open data, or is it one-sided data with an agenda?

Steve Burr: Yes, that's what definitely needs to be reviewed and determined. Even beyond the MAC, another value of the diversity of those MAC members, many of whom are scientists is they have connections and are able to network with other scientists, too.

Rick Ellis: But the data collection, that's the key right there. You've got your frame of reference on what data was collected.

Steve Burr: Yes.

Rick Ellis: And that's the same - I have the same concern Bill does as to who is collecting the data.

Bill Hopkin: Yes.

Steve Burr: Certainly data collection methodologies would be reviewed, also. You know, there is such thing as bad science.

Juan Palma: Let me make sure that we clarify at this point, that from the BLM perspective, when we do our environmental impact statement, we're not relying on the data that this group that we are so far not naming, is collecting. You know, we don't rely on that data. That group collects data for their own purposes.

If they're going to take us to court or if they're going to challenge us somehow, you know, they have their data. Let me just say that from the court's perspective, I think that they do give some, a large degree of deference to the organization, in this case of BLM, and our scientists and our analysis. When we do analyze the data, it will be the BLM data. We might have gotten it from a university or somewhere else, but it'll be the BLM data - we won't be using this group's data on, when we do the analysis. So I can assure you of that, and kind of put your minds at ease that when we get to - we're not there. We're not anywhere close to that, but when we get to that point of analyzing any kind of scientific data, it will be well founded, universities and others that will be doing the data, not some of this Citizen Scientists that might be collecting this information. They're probably collecting it for their own purpose and not solely to give it to us, the BLM.

John Harja: However, this particular group is very good at getting BLM to put entire alternatives in their EIS that reflect their view. Look at the sage grouse, and you can see exactly that happening. So yes, the science needs to be examined and analyzed and decided whether it's good or not, but we do see things appearing in EISs that do reflect those viewpoints. And vice versa, we see things in the EISs reflecting commodity use.

Juan Palma: Yes

John Harja: Bill, if I could, right here on this one.

Bill Hopkin: Okay.

John Harja: The way this is worded is very troublesome to the state.

Man: John, just repeat where you are in the document.

John Harja: Goal 1E, Page 12.

This is where we started before we deviated off into EISs in particular. But there is a word here that says, ensure that discretionary uses are compatible. And then the next sentence, permits will not be issued for incompatible purposes. This is decision language. This is a guidance

document saying, you shall not do this or that or the other. It is being pre-decisional the way it's written.

I also have a comment about the words, conservation, protection, restoration. This goes throughout this document. Each of these things, these units was created with a document, a presidential proclamation, a congressional statement. That is the management regime. This document and the national one seem to portray the fact that that has been amended to include the words conservation, protection and restoration.

I don't agree with that. The state doesn't agree with that. That's explanatory language in the law, the omnibus bill, but it is not directive language. It does not say, do this, this or this. So throughout here, my suggestion is you move towards saying, we will manage according to the prescriptions of the creation document, whatever that is.

They're different. And some of them are very tight. And at some places, you say, we're going to conserve, restore or protect WSAs. WSAs are clearer. There's an interim management protection scheme that is, you know, the way it is. And that's what you have to do. You can't change that with this document.

Juan Palma: Okay. A lot of very good input, thank you.

John Harja: I have one question about the one just above, Goal 1D. I don't have any real problem with it, Demonstration Center for New and Innovative Management, but what is that? Would you truly want to put new and innovative things on conservation units as opposed to other BLM lands or nearby state lands?

Bill Hopkin: Especially those with a proclamation that defines what they're...

John Harja: Right. I don't understand. Explain what is innovative management that might apply only to conservation units as opposed to any other BLM lands. I see lots of innovation coming from the oil and gas folks. Clearly that's normal BLM lands, so how is this different, I guess?

Juan Palma: Any thoughts, Bunny, on that?

- Bunny Sterin: I think that the objective here is to promote these units as having a place to allow projects to be done, for example, a restoration project or recreation project, something like that, maybe even some vegetative projects could be on these lands that can apply to other lands if they are a location where you can have a science project take place.
- John Harja: So that this - as a possible location for a science project?
- Bunny Sterin: Yes. And that is part of the goals of NLCS is to promote science to occur on the NLCS lands.
- John Harja: I guess my question then would be, we've got a lot of need for this very same thing in the sage grouse areas. Would this take priority over sage grouse, is the question for BLM. How would that fit in? I think you could - you need both, so.
- Juan Palma: Yes. I would think I need both. Jim you had a comment?
- Jim Allison: Yes, I just was going to point out that this is one of the things we dealt with on the earlier draft as well, that there are things in these goals, bits of language that we have questions about, object to, but those are not changeable, right. Those come out of the national strategy.
- John Harja: Oh, I disagree.
I'm sorry, just because it comes from Washington, I don't feel I have to agree with it.
- Jim Allison: No, I mean, I think we can disagree with it...
- John Harja: Well I, you know, I'm going to ask Juan to do precisely that. He's going to have to run it back up the food chain, but if you want the advice of the RAC, my advice is, this isn't going to work.
- Jim Allison: Yes. Or maybe what we can do better is, though, is to sort of ask for clarification...
- John Harja: ...confusing the issue. Let's talk about how to solve it.
- Juan Palma: I think the idea on some of this discussion, John, is that there's some hypothesis that we need to test. I don't know, for example, we don't have

seedings in the monument. You know, and I've been to them. Lots of seedings have been up there on the monument, from the 50s, 60s, 70s.

Our hypothesis could be, what if we just have native seeds in one plot, a plot of 5000 acres, 2000 acres. Would that do better or the same? I'm just talking out loud. Would the hypothesis be that grazing would be, do just fine in a seeding environment, we know has been seeded 10, 20, 30 years ago, or one that has got natural foraging vegetation? Would it be about the same? That would be a hypothesis. Let's test it. Let's test the hypothesis.

You know, some people say, you know, cattle will only do well if you do the seedings, and the seedings included some kind of a grasses and forage that are, you know, more towards cattle. But is that true? So this is, I think, what is referring to, can we test some of those hypotheses on some of those units.

And then if - the answer may be yes they do better on this seeding, and they don't do as well on natural, but the answer may be it's about the same. And if it's about the same, can we apply that applied knowledge of that hypothesis across all of BLM? I think that's where we're getting to in this process, Bunny.

John Harja:

Right. I don't disagree, Juan. In fact, I would say, just from scientific methodologies, you may need to have one in a conservation area and one nearby that's not, just to get control. The question really is about budget, because I can hypothesize that a closer well spacing in the Uinta Basin or in a sage grouse area will do the following, and it should be tested there as opposed to anywhere else.

So if we're doing these studies of things, on particular topics, what is the priority for your limited budget? Is it grazing in the monument, or is it oil and gas where the money's going, that's my question.

Juan Palma:

Well, the thing about it is, going back to Bill's question about 20 minutes ago on the budget, is that the budgets do come in pockets. So the money for the monument does come in its own line to the monument, in that what we call 1711. Can we get some of that funding to that initiative so that we can do some of this - projects, but that'd be the ones that we're talking about.

So getting projects down on the monument doesn't really impact oil and gas or others, because, different money.

John Harja: Might - if it's important to do it there, it's clearly not important to do it somewhere else. You know, anyway.

Bill Hopkin: Let's got to Page 13. Two-A, it says "Emphasize an ecosystem-based approach." We've got to define ecosystem.

The other thing is that a whole bunch of these NLCS units are just a sliver of an ecosystem so if that is something that is - if that specific goal is something that is coming from the feds, I guess we don't have the ability to change it but it's kind of not appropriate.

Jim Allison: Emphasize it where it makes sense and de-emphasize it where it doesn't.

Bill Hopkin: Yes. Again, 2B on that page, the first bullet says, "Develop and maintain cooperative agreements with gateway communities," but I think that, again, ought to say the state, the county and...

Lowell Braxton: State and local governments.

Bill Hopkin: Yes, state and local government.

Goal 2C, "Work with Congress, tribes, other federal and state agencies and national and local communities to identify and protect lands that are critical to the long term ecological sustainability of the landscape." Call me paranoid, but that sounds to me like BLM is including as one of their goals to go find more NLCS lands that need special protection. And I don't think that ought to be their job. Am I wrong?

Bunny Sterin: It's not our job. I think this is here to look at things like wildlife corridors and those kinds of things...

You know, to enhance those corridors when the corridors are within NLCS unit. So I don't like this goal either, because I totally agree with you, it really does appear that it's looking at us to try to make recommendations for lands, but it's - that's not it at all. That's not our job and it's not our place to do that.

Man: Is this the Washington office language?

Bunny Sterin: It is, yes.

Juan Palma: I can see where you read it that way.

Bunny Sterin: It's not my favorite goal either. It does make it sound like that, but we can't really change that.

Jim Allison: So it would only be the BLM's job in the context of the - an RMP identifying, areas of critical environmental concern or something, but not in terms of identifying land...

John Harja: Could you add to it, and say that you'll work with your state and county partners and private citizens to identify other tools beyond acquisition that might serve conservation purposes?

Bunny Sterin: Sure.

John Harja: It says, acquire, which is problematic.

Man: Yes.

Bunny Sterin: Thank you.

Bill Hopkin: Next page. So this was the one that was basically 2B was kind of supposed to define socio-economic.

Bunny Sterin: Yes.

Bill Hopkin: I guess one of the important things to me is that we not ought to just look at the socio-economic benefits or liabilities of it being an NLCS property. We also ought to be including the socio-economics of the traditional uses. Does that make sense?

Man: Well, it makes sense, but that's not a strategy for NLCS at the state level.

Bill Hopkin: Why?

Man: Well, to me that's totally separate. I mean, this is a strategic plan for units within the NLCS, not other BLM lands.

Bill Hopkin: Well, but within the NLCS, you have traditional uses, right?

Man: Well yes, you may have traditional uses, but you just said something to the effect that this should be for all BLM lands, which rightly so, but that's - I don't see that as a purpose of this document.

Bill Hopkin: I didn't say all BLM lands. I'm talking about just the NLCS parcels, emphasizing...

Man: Maybe I misunderstood what you were saying, then.

Jim Allison: No, if I understand what Bill's saying, it's that you can read this as implying that we ought to be studying the effects of designating national conservation lands and how that benefits communities. But his point, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, is that there already are economic benefits to those lands before the designation and presumably carrying on after the designation, and that those are important to study and understand as well.

Bill Hopkin: Right.

Bill Hopkin: Well I promised I wouldn't say state and county again once...

Man: But it's in there.

Juan Palma: We're on Page 15 now.

Man: Mostly, we're following Bill through his comments right now.

Bill Hopkin: You know, I would appreciate something in 3D on Goal 15, because I'm assuming the bullet points are not necessarily national strategy, they're state strategy, right?

Bunny Sterin: Correct.

Bill Hopkin: I would appreciate something in that one that has to do with ag-related grazing groups. Actually, we're talking about other partners, schools and so forth that can be brought in to make things better. Let me just go back for a minute and ask Steve. Steve, do you have, on the Monument Advisory Committee, do you have a PhD range scientist with experience in grazing management?

Steve Burr: We have Kevin Heaton who is an extension educator for Garfield and Kane Counties, and I believe he has degrees in range management. We just had Jim Bowns, who's been at Southern Utah University that is a systems ecologist

and has experience in range. He has stepped down, so we currently have a vacancy.

And then we also have a vacancy for the grazing representative, because Steve Westhoff stepped down because he and his wife are off on a mission. That being said, I'm trying to remember who the botanist is, I want to say Gordon Bosworth.

Bill Hopkin: Okay.

Steve Burr: So, you know, we have a number of people that are, you know, familiar or have expertise in that area. That being said, I mean, one of the compliments that Steve Westhoff, the grazing representative on the MAC who just went off said that he's been very impressed with the range managers, the BLM staff there on the monument.

Bill Hopkin: Goal 3E at the bottom of the page on 15, another group that I think would be really helpful there are university range and wildlife clubs.

John Harja: We've dealt with most of my comments. I just have one on the glossary on Page 18, Wilderness Study Areas. The definition, at the end you say, "a work-through planning process authorized by Section 202 of (FLPMA)." I don't believe that's accurate.

Bunny Sterin: Thank you.

Man: Not - that's not accurate because...

John Harja: Because it's not legal.

Bunny Sterin: It's no longer allowed.

Man: Okay. That's something from the past that's in there.

John Harja: Skip ahead to Page 28 under Goal 2C. Now these, in Appendix A, these are local goals, is that correct?

Bunny Sterin: Yes.

John Harja: So, first thing you say, the Moab field office will determine whether information produced by the upcoming ecosystems services project - what is that?

Man: So we're in Wilderness Study Areas.

Bill Hopkin: Two-C, first bullet.

Bunny Sterin: It's something that's being done by USGS with BLM.

John Harja: Some study that's being done?

Bunny Sterin: Yes, that's a local study.

John Harja: I'd like to learn more about that (unintelligible).

Jim Allison: Okay.

John Harja: If we go back to Page 11, Goal 1A, third bullet, "Establish conservation and restoration priorities for wilderness, wilderness study areas and historic trails," - restoration priorities, I don't understand.

Man: Or wilderness study area, right, because you're not in...

John Harja: Not supposed to do anything like that.

Bunny Sterin: What's it - oh, just if there's restoration that needs to be done, for example, some of the old roads closed and restored in Cedar Mesa - I mean, in Cedar Mountain...

John Harja: So some reclamation type activity?

Bunny Sterin: Yes. When roads get put in when they're not supposed to be, those kinds of things. So we need to prioritize...

John Harja: Could we focus on something like that just to make an example of reclamation of illegal activities or something?

Bunny Sterin: Okay.

John Harja: I would love for you to restore the cheatgrass inside some areas, but I don't think you can do it.

Bunny Sterin: I'll put that in there.

John Harja: Yes, go ahead.

Bunny Sterin: So you want an example ...

John Harja: Well, I'm just trying to understand what it is, because wilderness, wilderness study areas are typically not supposed to do much in there, so if you're saying - reclamation of illegal trespass makes sense to me.

Bunny Sterin: Got you.

Juan Palma: And I've seen it, John, where some old wilderness we've - because, I mean, like old cars and all kinds of stuff, when we had, like service projects for the scouts where rather they'd go out there and get all the stuff out. You have Saturday you'd get a truckload full of stuff, you know, comes out of that wilderness...

John Harja: And that's a level of activity I'm fine, but when you use the words here I'm thinking big things like cheatgrass and...

Juan Palma: Oh yes.

John Harja: ...you know, that kind of stuff that is...

Bill Hopkin: Restoration project.

John Harja: Restoration projects, yes.

I've said some of my comments are kind of found all throughout. Goal 1E on Page 27, same question, "Evaluate all proposed discretionary uses within wilderness study areas." Do you have a management plan for the wilderness study areas already?

Bunny Sterin: No. And where is this, John?

John Harja: Page 27, Goal 1E, second bullet.

It's related to the same thing that I'm saying, that you have management for wilderness study areas, so either you're saying too much here, or you need to back up and clarify it like we just talked about. What is it that you think is not compatible with your plan?

I'm not saying that well. Your plan should tell you - your RMP should tell you what you can do inside WSAs.

Bunny Sterin: Correct.

John Harja: How is this different?

Bunny Sterin: It isn't.

John Harja: Okay, then why are we saying it?

Bill Hopkin: So as you go to the individual units, it seems like something that would help, and maybe get this paper saving rule, but seems how you'd be nice to have the proclamation for each of those. I mean, they're just short, aren't they?

Bunny Sterin: Not necessarily.

John Harja: Not necessarily, no.

Bunny Sterin: And we've got what in the appendix...

Jim Allison: It's at the very end.

Bunny Sterin: Yes.

Jim Allison: It looks like we're planning to add in links

Bill Hopkin: Oh, okay.

Bunny Sterin: We've got the links to it on the back page.

Jim Allison: But I do wonder if it wouldn't be better to have that link, you know, I don't know, I guess it works best for the Monument and the conservation areas, but to have a link right here to the proclamation, establishing that...

Bill Hopkin: You could have it both places that...

Jim Allison: Yes, you could have it both places.

John Harja: You don't have links to the other wilderness areas, like Cedar Mountains.

Bunny Sterin: I do in the back. There's another table.

Jim Allison: It's, I think, the Cedar Mountains...

John Harja: Which page?

Jim Allison: ...is the second to last page...

Bunny Sterin: On Page 40.

On Page 40 there's a table, an appendix with a table, and there's a link to every one of those designated wilderness areas.

John Harja: Okay, that's all right, then.

Bill Hopkin: ...some of these, like in Wilderness, doesn't have 2D, talks about each one.

Bunny Sterin: No, it doesn't have a goal if there's nothing specific to that.

Bill Hopkin: Okay, so what you're saying is that wilderness and wilderness study areas, the legislation that provided for those doesn't look at that economics? Is that what you're saying?

Bunny Sterin: No. So the economic part is in the main section, with the socio-economics, that's in the main component. And so we didn't write out specifically for the - we don't have it particularly for the wilderness study areas and the WSAs, we don't have a proposal to do an economic study for that, individually, at this point.

Man: Except for the Moab field office, there is something for the wilderness study areas in the Moab field office.

John Harja: Some of them had a 2D and some didn't, so that's why I asked.

Bunny Sterin: Does the Moab field office have an economist?

John Harja: That's because they have to have an economist?

Bunny Sterin: They do, yes.

John Harja: Well that's good. Spread them around a bit more, here.

Bill Hopkin: I think that's all I had, Jim.

Jim Allison: Okay. Did you have more, John, or?

John Harja: No, I think I'm good.

Jim Allison: Okay, so I think we're - let's hear the people on the phone. Do any of you, Porter, Rick or Steve have any specific things you want to bring up?

Steve Burr: No, I don't have anything specifically.

Rick Ellis: No. I think I've addressed just a few questions I had. I do have a concern, again, about the whole blanket approach to the wilderness study areas and evidently that's not really a concern of this document.

Jim Allison: Porter, did you have anything?

Porter Teegarden: No. I feel like I've put in input. I think it's a big improvement from the original document we got, so.

Jim Allison: Okay.

John Harja: Hey, I just noticed something, on Page 33 under FLPMA.

Bunny Sterin: He's still going.

John Harja: No, it says, in November of 1980 Utah BLM sent their recommendations for wilderness study areas to Congress.

Bunny Sterin: That's correct.

John Harja: Is that the inventory areas that you were concluded?

Bunny Sterin: That's what became the WSAs.

John Harja: In 1993, you sent your recommendations for designation as Wilderness to Congress. I'm trying to make sure we're doing, saying the right thing. In 1998, you had not yet finished your recommendations for designation. So what is it that was sent to Congress?

Bunny Sterin: The WSA recommendation in '93, that was the suitability and unsuitability.

John Harja: Yes, well, then use those terms. But in '93 the President sent the final recommendation of, for Utah to Congress saying, make these areas wilderness, make these WSA wilderness, was all I'm saying.

Juan Palma: What page are you on, John?

John Harja: I'm on Page 33. I'm trying to make sure we're using the right language. And you may be right,

Bill Hopkin: Well, the general public got cut off.

Sherry Foot: Operator, are we back on our call?

Coordinator: Yes, you are reconnected.

Sherry Foot: Thank you. Members on the call, are you still with us? Rick Ellis? Porter?

Coordinator: Excuse me, Steven Burr has joined.

Sherry Foot: Apologies, and we're not exactly sure what happened right there, but it looks like all of us were bumped off the call. So we're going to be placing you on mute for just a moment till the others call in. Thank you.

Coordinator: Excuse me. This is the conference coordinator. Today's conference is being recorded. You may continue.

Sherry Foot: We'll continue.

Jim Allison: So back to business, we feel like we were kind of winding down. Lowell just rejoined us. I don't know if you have any comments you would like to make on this.

Lowell Braxton: No. There's nothing.

Lowell Braxton: Is there anybody who wants to add anything?

Steve Burr: Bunny, what's the next step here? Is there a date for the release of this to the public? One of the reasons I ask is there are several members of the MAC that are interested in seeing this as soon as they can.

Sherry Foot: Because this is a sub-group meeting, we do have to report findings to the full RAC.

Steve Burr: Right.

Sherry Foot: And then the full RAC will make their recommendations and so forth to BLM.

Steve Burr: Okay. Has the next RAC meeting actually been established?

Sherry Foot: No.

Jim Allison: So are we going to have to set up a meeting, 30 days plus a little bit out to deal with this?

Sherry Foot: Yes. And we can do that via conference call again if that works for everyone. I understand that Lowell will be gone most of July, which will be the 30 days that I'll need in order to get a Federal Register notice done. So the first part of August.

Jim Allison: After the 12th through - I've got another field project starting late July and running till...

Bunny Sterin: So in the meantime - and I know this is just moving a little bit away from procedure, maybe or maybe not, in the meantime can I go ahead and - I mean, what is your - I guess, what's your recommendation going to be?

Jim Allison: Well I don't know. I guess we have to talk about that as...

John Harja: Just listen to everything we said today and see if you can make changes...

Jim Allison: Yes, I think that's basically it, is the recommendation - as far as I'm concerned, the subcommittee report to the RAC is that we think this is a much improved document, but we still have comments. And so we think the RAC's

recommendation should be simply to view the comments that we've made in the reporting and take the document through a draft before releasing it.

Juan Palma: So Jim, the presentation at the RAC, whenever we schedule that, middle or so part of August, is it - the RAC would get this document with the changes that we talked about today? Or do you envision that the current document with the comments that we heard today presented to the RAC?

Jim Allison: Well I think what Sherry is saying as far as procedure goes is that, really the RAC needs to make the recommendation that I am suggesting here, which we can't do without Federal Register notification. So I'm not sure if it would be appropriate - and I don't know the applicable laws on this, but I don't think it's appropriate to present the next draft to the RAC at that meeting, is it? Or do we have to recommend...

Bunny Sterin: Go ahead. I mean, this is - it's just a question, and I don't know the procedures on the RAC, but it - I'm wondering if, because you're a subgroup, and you've made comments, or (offered) comment. If I implement - put those comments in here and then give it to you guys as a subgroup again, the same draft, under (line 9)...

...and you review that again before that goes to the RAC, and make sure that I've got everything that we've talked about put in here...

Lowell Braxton: Then we would recommend to the RAC they adopt the one that we have.

Bunny Sterin: Yes.

Sherry Foot: Correct.

Bill Hopkin: Could you do that in Track Changes? Or is that too hard?

Lowell Braxton: I would just do it, quite frankly.

Bunny Sterin: Yes. It makes it really difficult, because there's two of us working on it. And we've tried to do it through Google Docs and it just, it - we couldn't make it work.

Steve Burr: Well in the minutes of this meeting, and again I missed about the first ten minutes or so, could a bullet list be developed of the comments folks have

been - folks have made, and then Bunny, you could respond as to what you did with those in the document?

Bunny Sterin: Sure.

Bill Hopkin: That would work.

Bunny Sterin: If the subgroup then could take another look at that and then say thumbs up, and then let the RAC adopt it, would - does that work?

Man: That will work.

Bunny Sterin: Because that way we can get it on the street, and...

Jim Allison: So can the subgroup's comments officially go to Bunny...

Sherry Foot: Yes.

Jim Allison: ...today? Because we did do - I mean, we are doing this...

Sherry Foot: Yes, same as what we did for the last one as well, because the BLM will have to incorporate those - the comments. And then she is asking for the subgroup to look at it one more time before it goes to the RAC, so yes.

Jim Allison: Okay. That's good.

Juan Palma: Jim, I think that would work. It - and then what I envision, whenever we have the RAC meeting the - whatever day we select to have it, is that Lowell will sign a letter to me - it could be just one or two paragraphs, saying that the RAC recommends that this document or - would be, recommends that we implement this document.

There may be some - in that letter there might be some things that you would say, you know, I'm just thinking out loud. We recommend that you do A or B or C in that letter, but other than that, move forward with it, as the recommendation of the RAC. That's what I would envision at that RAC meeting.

The outcome of this RAC meeting is this - either a single page or a two-page letter that says, we recommend you move forward. We still want you to do one or two things, and that would be the end part. And then from there we just, then it becomes public after that.

Jim Allison: Okay.

John Harja: So it would be - is the purpose of the RAC meeting, to kind of get RAC consensus on this revised document that Bunny's going to work on right now? So legally, at that posted, approved RAC meeting, if some of the RAC members have some issues within that document, can we go ahead and agree on making those changes so that we don't have to meet again?

Juan Palma: That's what I'm saying, this letter that Lowell will give to me...

John Harja: So that's what's in the letter.

Juan Palma: Yes, it may say, you know...

John Harja: Okay. I got you.

Jim Allison: Okay. So then, so then are we suggesting that Bunny's next draft just go to everybody on the committee, we schedule a meeting, we do it or do we have to go through the subcommittee one more time, with one more meeting of the subcommittee, or can we do it by email or... Can we look at the draft?

Sherry Foot: Yes, you can look at the draft.

Jim Allison: And get opinions about whether we need to have another meeting?

Sherry Foot: Yes, because we're not making any recommendations at this point, you are just reviewing what has been given to Bunny - it's just for information gathering purposes only. As long as we keep it within those standards we will not have to announce it as a regular meeting. However, when we go to bring this forward to the full RAC, yes we will, okay.

Jim Allison: Okay, so - right, so as a way of proceeding, then, if Bunny writes another draft with whatever help she has, but...

Sherry Foot: Right.

Jim Allison: ...if we get another draft next week or two weeks out or something. It goes to all of the subcommittee members.

Jim Allison: And at that point everybody on the subcommittee can read it and say, you know, good enough for me, let's go to the full RAC. Or somebody could come back and say, you know, I think we need to talk about this more as a subcommittee....

Sherry Foot: And if that's the case...

Jim Allison: If that's the case...

Sherry Foot: ...then we're going to announce it. That's right.

John Harja: But you probably could legitimately, I mean, if there is a little bit of understanding between John Harja, what John Harja said and Bunny said...

Sherry Foot: Right, clarification.

John Harja: ...that could - clarification could be made, without...

Sherry Foot: That's correct, without having - that's right.

John Harja: Okay.

Lowell Braxton: Well I'm just wondering whether we need to have a subcommittee meeting, because...

Man: That's what we're trying to avoid.

Lowell Braxton: Well I think that's the direction you're going in as well. If we can come up with a good document, and if we are really wanting to have input from the non-subcommittee members of the RAC, I would say you just do it. We notice it. We do it, we notice it, and that's the document that we rip apart in front of the RAC. Does that cut you out of it too much, Jim, or your subcommittee?

Jim Allison: I don't think so. I feel like we've had our crack at it.

Lowell Braxton: Yes.

Jim Allison: We've had a lot to say about it, and we just...

Bill Hopkin: We've just tore it up about as much as we can.

Jim Allison: Yes. I mean, I was, you know, aside from the few comments I had at the beginning, I was reasonably happy with this draft, although I certainly agree, you know, when these, when Bill and John started pointing out that, you know, it really should talk about state and local government, I can see their point and I agree that that's a valid thing, you know, and some of those things.

But as far as I'm concerned, we're close, I think, you know, given the comments, you know, we've made here. And I think the next draft probably ought to go to the full RAC. That's what I would draw...

Lowell Braxton: And I like the idea of cutting out another meeting and just getting down to the meat of it.

Juan Palma: And I would think that the full RAC may give some deference to the subcommittee.

Lowell Braxton: Well sure. They should.

Juan Palma: You talk about it, you know, you explain the process. Because to some of them it may be all new, and the conversation may be new to them, but it won't be new to some of you. You could explain to them. But if there are some things that are still important to the RAC, as a collective RAC, they can certainly let me know what those are and then, you know, they can - the RAC can decide to go see the document one more time or it can decide, here's our comments.

Implement them, but we don't want to talk about this topic anymore. That could be the outcome of that.

Sherry Foot: Okay.

Jim Allison: Then I guess that's sort of what the subcommittee's saying is here's our comments on the transcript...

Juan Palma: Well let me just say if, Lowell, as we begin to bring some closure to the meeting, this is really important. And I'll tell you why it's so important to myself, not only because we have these units now here in the Utah BLM, but I don't know what'd be the outcome of some discussions going out there in the public arena about, you know, what Utah intends to do, especially in Eastern Utah.

But certainly this sets, I think, a tone - at a minimum a tone for any of those NLCS type units. So I think that this document, in my mind is really important. That's why I thought - I think that you all taking a look at it is

really critical, that we get your feelings. Because it provides at a minimum a tone of direction, and that's really important, as much as anything else.

You know, tone to leadership is really critical. And we're getting more than that. We're getting more than just tone, we get into specifics in the language, so getting that input from you all as the RAC members, or subcommittee members, Jim, is - it's really critical to myself.

Because when we get this document finalized, I do intend to, with Bunny and others, spend some time with our managers talking about this document, once we get to that point in the process.

Lowell Braxton: I guess we should notice that there are members of the public on the phone right now, and if they have input that they'd like to make, this would be a good time to do it. If you care to do so, please identify yourself and then move forward. Silence reigned and we all got wet, I guess.

For the record, there were no public comments offered. Thanks very much, Juan, for what you said. I think we need to recognize Jim's hard work right here, and his subcommittee as well, so thank you for that as well. I believe this concludes our meeting, then. Is that correct?

Sherry Foot: That's correct. And I will get back with you on a date for the next meeting. It sounds like it might be sometime in mid August. So keep your calendars open for around that time frame, but I will provide you with a better date once we as a group come up with that. Thank you everyone. Appreciate your time, and have a good week.

END

Approved: ____/s/ William Hopkin – vice-Chair_____
Chairman

Dated: ____07/09/2013____